Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
Development Plan Document (DPD)

Consultation Statement

September 2017

www.lancaster.gov.uk
www.southlakeland.gov.uk

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
Promoting City, Coast & Countryside

SOUTH LAKELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This document sets out how South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) and Lancaster City Council (LCC), with the support of Arnside & Silverdale AONB Partnership, have involved the community and relevant organisations in the preparation of the Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Development Plan Document (AONB DPD). It shows how we have complied with **Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) 2012 Regulations**. The AONB DPD has been produced by both Local Planning Authorities with involvement from the AONB Partnership. The AONB DPD identifies sites for new housing and employment to meet local needs and sets out planning policies to ensure that development reflects the AONB designation. The DPD will form part of both authorities' Local Plans once adopted. All documents, reports and responses referred to in this document are available on or via the Councils' websites and the AONB Partnership's website.

1.2 The engagement processes during the preparation of the AONB DPD have been guided by South Lakeland District Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and Lancaster City Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Table 1 below shows how we have reflected our respective SCIs in the consultation methods used in the preparation of the AONB DPD.

Table 1: SCI requirements vs. Consultation Methods Used

Consultation Method	South Lakeland SCI recommendations for consultation on DPDs?	Lancaster City SCI requirement for consultation on DPDs	Undertaken for AONB DPD consultations?
Making consultation documents available at Council Offices and local libraries	✔	✔	✔
Documents available on the Council's website and electronic consultation response options	✔	✔	✔
Using local press, TV and radio	✔	✔	✔
Using existing channels / networks	✔	✔	✔
Key stakeholder groups	✔	✔	✔
Issuing a questionnaire	X	✔	✔
Exhibitions, leaflets and/or posters	✔	X	X
Focus Groups	X	X	X

1.3 At the first key stage in the preparation of the AONB DPD, the public were invited to comment on an Issues and Options Discussion Paper between Friday 6 November 2015 and 5pm Friday 18 December 2015. The Issues and Options document set out a series of questions, seeking feedback on options for the topics to be covered by the DPD, the direction of policies and on sites that had been put forward for consideration for development or protection. As a result of this consultation, new sites were suggested for consideration and a further 5-week period of consultation was allowed for people to comment on them.

1.4 Prior to the Issues and Options consultation, the public and other stakeholders were engaged in a range of evidence gathering exercises. These included:

- Housing Needs Survey;
- Call for Sites;
- Site Assessment Methodology; and
- Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

1.5 Using consultation responses gathered at the Issues and Options stage, as well as our detailed site assessment information and other studies and evidence, we prepared a Draft Plan. Public consultation on the Draft Plan took place between Thursday 10 November 2016 and 5pm Thursday 5 January 2017, seeking feedback on draft policies and proposed sites for development or protection.

1.6 As part of consultation on the Draft Plan, three key site changes were suggested to the Councils for consideration. This included changes to the site and arrangement of two sites already consulted upon and the reintroduction of part of a site previously withdrawn from the process. A targeted pre-publication consultation was held for 4 weeks from 19 June to 17 July 2017 to enable people to comment son these prior to publication of the final plan.

1.7 This Consultation Statement provides a summary of:

- Which bodies and persons we have engaged with in the plan preparation;
- How these bodies and persons have been engaged;
- A summary of the main issues raised by these bodies and persons and how they have been taken into account; and
- The next steps for community and stakeholder engagement.

1.8 The main aims of engagement were to:

- **Promote awareness** of the rationale for preparing a DPD for the AONB and how this fits in with the South Lakeland Local Plan and Lancaster City Local Plans;
- **Highlight** and raise awareness of the limitations of the plan;
- **Encourage people to comment;**
- Promote awareness of and **encourage stakeholders to attend meetings;**

- **Gather people's views** on policy content and sites**;**
- **Explain** to people how and when their comments will be **taken into account** and when they can expect **feedback**;
- **Explain** the remaining **stages** in preparing the **development plan document** and further opportunities to get involved.

Duty to Co-operate

1.9 When producing a Development Plan Document, Section 33A of the 2011 Localism Act requires Councils to co-operate with a number of bodies. This is known as the 'duty to cooperate'. These bodies are set out in Appendix 1. We have engaged with these bodies throughout the preparation of the AONB DPD including by writing directly to them. Their comments also informed the Site Assessment Form criteria.

2.0 Who we have engaged

Issues and Options Discussion Paper, Draft Plan and Pre-publication Consultation

2.1 The Issues and Options Discussion Paper consultation was the first main public consultation undertaken as part of the preparation of the AONB DPD. As well as giving people chance to get involved in the preparation of the AONB DPD, the aim of this consultation was to gather communities' and individuals' views, thoughts and ideas on what topic areas should be covered by policies in the AONB DPD, the overall development strategy for the AONB and which sites might be suitable for development to meet local housing needs.

2.2 Consultation on the Draft Plan gave people chance to comment on the policies we had drafted and the sites we were proposing to allocate for development or designate for protection. It also gave them chance to see how their earlier feedback had been taken into account.

2.3 At both these stages, we sought to engage with all individuals, communities, organisations and stakeholders who may be affected by and/or have an interest in the AONB DPD to make sure all relevant stakeholders and communities were clear on:

- the purpose of the AONB DPD, the process of preparing it and how and when they may be affected;
- how and when they can comment on and get involved in preparing the AONB DPD and what they can and can't influence;
- how and when their comments will be taken into account by the Councils and when they can expect feedback;
- the remaining stages in preparing the AONB DPD and further opportunities to comment.

Table 2: Who we engaged with on the Issues and Options Discussion paper and Draft Plan
Specific Consultation Bodies
• Statutory bodies: Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England.
• Duty to Co-operate bodies
• Town / Parish Councils and Local Planning Authorities covering or adjoining the AONB
General Consultation Bodies
• Members of the public
• AONB Partnership
• Local and County Council Elected Members (Councillors)
• Development Industry and landowners
• Service and Infrastructure Providers

• Groups representing voluntary, racial/ethnic, national, religious, disability and business interests.
• Specific groups representing certain interests who may cover for example environmental, health, education, transport, leisure, economic development and community needs or equalities issues.

2.4 The pre-publication consultation involved all key stakeholder organisations but was otherwise targeted towards those who had previously been involved in consultations on the DPD or who were directly affected by the three site changes being consulted on. Posters, parish council involvement and website coverage provided opportunities for those who were not contacted directly to also be involved.

Extra Sites Consultation

2.5 The additional 5-week consultation period following the main Issues and Options consultation allowing people the chance to comment on new site suggestions was targeted primarily at those who had responded to the main consultation. It included the statutory and general consultation bodies referred to above, although households were only contacted directly if they had responded to the main consultation. Local media was used to ensure wider awareness of the consultation.

Housing Needs Survey

2.6 Cumbria Rural Housing Trust (CRHT) was commissioned in 2014 by SLDC and LCC, with the support of Arnside & Silverdale AONB Partnership, to conduct a Housing Needs Survey with the aim to provide parish-level evidence to supplement existing housing needs evidence previously prepared by South Lakeland District and Lancaster City Councils.

Table 3: Who we engaged with on the Housing Needs Survey
• Members of the public

2.7 This included all 4,031 households identified within the AONB boundary, as well as residents of the part of Beetham Parish that falls outside of the AONB boundary.

Call for sites

2.8 Individuals and organisations were invited to put forward suggestions of sites to be considered for inclusion in the AONB DPD between 12 December 2014 and 28 February 2015. Through this process we asked for proposals to be put forward for any sites believed to be suitable for housing, affordable housing, employment, community use or other development, or for locally important open space.

Table 4: Who we engaged with on the Call for Sites
Specific Consultation Bodies
• Statutory bodies: Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England.
• Duty to Cooperate bodies
• Town / Parish Councils and Local Planning Authorities covering or adjoining the AONB
General Consultation Bodies
• Members of the public
• Local and County Council Elected Members (Councillors)
• Groups representing voluntary, racial/ethnic, national, religious, disability and business interests.
• Specific groups representing certain interests who may cover for example environmental, health, education, transport, leisure, economic development and community needs or equalities issues.

Site Assessment Methodology

2.9 SLDC and LCC consulted a select group of consultees asking for comments on the site assessment methodology, which has been used to assess the site suggestions made through the Call for Sites. The consultation looked to assess stakeholder views on whether the draft site assessment pro-forma provided a reasonable set of criteria for assessing the site suggestions, or whether it could be modified or improved.

2.10 The following organisations made representations on the methodology.

- AONB Partnership
- Parish Councils
- Coal Authority
- Cumbria County Council
- First Trans Pennine Express
- Friends of the Lake District
- Planning Consultants
- Historic England
- Home Builders Federation
- Lancaster Civic Society
- Lancashire County Council
- Marine Management Organisation
- Natural England
- NHS Cumbria
- Office of Rail and Road
- Arnside Parish Plan Trust

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

2.11 Hyder Consulting (UK) Ltd (now called Arcadis) prepared a draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report on behalf of SLDC and LCC. The scoping report is the first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process for the emerging DPD and is used to set the scope and level of detail of the SA. In line with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, we consulted with the three statutory consultees (Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England) on a draft of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. This consultation

ran for a five week period between 3 June and 8 July 2015. The final Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was subject to public consultation at Issues and Options stage.

Table 5: Who we engaged with on the draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
Specific Consultation Bodies
• Statutory bodies: Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England.

2.12 At the Draft Plan consultation stage, people were also invited to comment on a draft Sustainability Appraisal Report, which set out the assessment of the sites and policies in the Draft Plan.

Equalities

2.13 We consulted directly with a range of community groups and organisations by contacting them by letter or email. This included organisations representing particular social groups including faith groups, people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, people with disabilities and particular age groups, including the young and elderly.

2.14 Methods of engagement used to help broaden the accessibility of the consultation include:

- Translation / other formats available for all documents on request
- Venues where documents were placed were accessible to those with disabilities
- Different methods of responding were available
- Ensuring the consultation was advertised through a variety of means
- Drop-in events so people could speak with us face-to-face

2.15 These and other methods will be used to ensure equality in participation throughout the process.

3.0 How we have engaged

Issues and Options Discussion Paper, Draft Plan and pre-publication consultation

3.1 The Issues and Options Consultation included consultation on; the Issues and Options Discussion Paper; maps showing all the sites suggested for consideration for development or protection and the final Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

3.2 The Draft Plan Consultation included consultation on the Draft Plan itself, maps showing the sites proposed for allocation for development, the sites proposed for designation for protection and evidence-base and supporting documents such as the draft Sustainability Report and Habitats Regulations Assessment.

3.3 The pre-publication consultation sought comments only on three proposed site changes resulting from comments made during the Draft Plan consultation. This was a very targeted consultation. Letters/emails were sent to key stakeholders, those who had previously been involved in consultations on the DPD and those who were directly affected by the three site changes. Posters, parish council involvement and website/social media coverage provided opportunities for those who were not contacted directly to also be involved.

3.4 In accordance with both Councils' SCIs, we used a range of methods to publicise the consultations and to engage people in the process. For the Issues and Options and Draft Plan consultations these were as follows.

3.5 Prior to the main consultations:

- **Press release to the local media**
- **Notices/adverts** in both the Westmorland Gazette and the Lancaster Guardian
- **Posters** issued to Parish Councils to place on parish notice boards
- **Letters/emails** sent to all relevant parties/individuals on the Councils' Consultation databases
- **Postcard sent to every residential address within the AONB (Issues and Option Stage only – at Draft Plan stage, everyone who had responded at Issues and Options stage was written to or emailed directly)**
- **Briefing at the AONB Partnership's Executive Committee** meetings (October 2015 and October 2016)
- Use of **Facebook and Twitter** to highlight the upcoming consultation
- Article in South Lakeland News, which goes to every household in South Lakeland (November 2015 and November 2016)

3.6 During the main consultations:

- Documents, including response forms, available at **Council offices, AONB Office and local libraries**
- Documents, including response forms, available on or via the **websites** of both Councils and the AONB Partnership
- **Drop-in events** held in every parish within the AONB
- Use of **Facebook and Twitter** to remind people of the drop-in events
- **Online response facility**

Extra Sites Consultation

3.7 The additional 5-week consultation period to allow people to comment on additional site suggestions made during the main Issues and Options consultation was more focused. It utilised the following methods:

- Documents, including response forms, available at **Council offices, AONB Office and local libraries**
- **Press release to the local media**
- **Posters** issued to Parish Councils to place on parish notice boards
- Documents, including response forms, available on or via the **websites** of both Councils and the AONB Partnership
- **Letters/emails** sent to all those who responded to the main consultation along with the statutory and other consultation bodies
- Use of **Facebook and Twitter**
- **Update briefing at the AONB Partnership's Executive Committee** meeting (March 30 2016)

Housing Needs Survey

3.8 The Housing Needs Survey was undertaken in May 2014. In order to promote awareness of the survey and to encourage people to complete it, we:

- **Wrote to 4,031 households** within the AONB boundary (and also to those in the part of Beetham Parish that falls outside the boundary) with a covering letter, survey form (Appendix 2) and prepaid self-addressed envelope. The return deadline was Monday 16th June 2013;
- Placed all relevant documents on the SLDC, Lancaster City and AONB Partnership **websites**;
- Made all relevant documents available at **Council Offices**;
- **Briefed Town and Parish Councils** by email/letter on the survey;
- SLDC and Lancaster City Council issued a **press release to the local media**
- A **Stakeholder Consultation event**, facilitated by the Arnside & Silverdale AONB Manager, was held on the 20th May 2014, with representation from the Parish Councils, local landowners and a number of organisations from the AONB Partnership.
- Used **Facebook & Twitter** to promote awareness of the Housing Needs Survey process.

3.9 The press release was published on all three websites. A meeting was also held with locally relevant Registered Social Landlords and stakeholders following the publication of the results of the Housing Needs Survey.

Call for sites

3.10 The Call for Sites for the AONB DPD took place from 12 December 2014 to 27 February 2015. Through this process we asked people to put forward proposals for any sites they believe to be suitable for housing, affordable housing, employment, community use or other development, or for important open space within the AONB. Site suggestions had to be made using a site suggestion form (Appendix 3). Immediately prior to the Call for Sites we:

- **Wrote (by email or letter) to individuals** who, at the time, were identified on the AONB DPD consultee database;
- Placed all relevant documents on SLDC, Lancaster City and the AONB Partnership **websites**;
- Made all relevant documents available at **Council Offices**;
- **Briefed all relevant District Councillors and County Councillors** by email/letter on the proposals and consultation process;
- **Briefed Town and Parish Councils** by email/letter on the proposals and consultation process;
- Issued a **press release to the local media**, which generated coverage in the local press and radio;
- Used **Facebook & Twitter** to promote awareness of the call for sites process.

3.11 During the Call for Sites we;

- **Enabled responses to be submitted by email, by post or by hand**;
- Used **Facebook & Twitter** to provide reminders about the Call for Sites.

3.12 Following this process, we published the 117 site suggestions received on the AONB Partnership website with links from SLDC and LCC websites.

Site Assessment Methodology

3.13 We consulted on a draft methodology with a number of consultees asking for comments on the site assessment methodology, which has been used to assess the site suggestions through Call for Sites. Immediately prior to the start of the consultation we:

- **Wrote (by email or letter) to individuals** who, at the time, were identified on the AONB DPD consultee database;
- Placed all relevant documents on SLDC, Lancaster City and the AONB Partnership **websites**;

3.14 During the consultation we;

- **Enabled responses to be by email, by post or by hand**;

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

3.15 Immediately prior to the start of the consultation we:

- **Wrote (by email or letter) to the statutory consultees** asking for comments in relation to the scope and remit of the Sustainability Appraisal
- Placed all relevant documents on SLDC, Lancaster City and the AONB Partnership **websites**.

3.16 During the consultation we;

- **Enabled responses to be submitted by email, by post or by hand**.

Stakeholder meetings

3.17 Throughout the plan preparation process we have worked closely with the AONB Partnership including providing updates at Executive Committee meetings and meeting regularly with the AONB Manager and AONB Officer to discuss approaches and scope of the document as well as supporting us in the detailed drafting of the Plan. The AONB Manager also worked closely with us on the site visits and wider site assessments and together, the lead officers from Lancaster and South Lakeland, along with the AONB Manager, form the core working group for the DPD.

3.18 Four stakeholder meetings facilitated by the AONB Partnership have been held to feed into the emerging AONB DPD. The initial Stakeholder Meeting was held on 20 May 2014 at Silverdale Golf Club to engage relevant key stakeholders such as Landowners, agents and Parish Councils on why a joint DPD was being produced and to publicise the Housing Needs Survey and next steps. Presentations were made by Officers from SLDC, Lancaster City Council and Cumbria Rural Housing Trust.

3.19 A second Stakeholder Meeting was held on 12 November 2014 at Greenlands Farm Village, where Cumbria Rural Housing Trust gave a presentation on the key findings of the Housing Needs Survey and information was provided on the next stages and opportunities for stakeholders to get involved.

3.20 A further Stakeholder Meeting was held on 9 June 2015 at Storth Village Hall to discuss the progress on the Development Plan Document (DPD), including the initial results of the Call for Sites process and the site assessment methodology.

3.21 A further stakeholder meeting was held on 14 November 2016 at Arnside Educational Institute as part of the Draft DPD consultation to present work so far, to discuss the content of the draft DPD and how to get involved in the consultation and to explain next steps.

3.22 A workshop with Infrastructure providers was held on 5 July 2016 to discuss AONB-wide and settlement and site-specific infrastructure constraints and opportunities.

3.23 A final stakeholder meeting is planned on 9 October 2017 at Warton Church Hall to present the publication version of the DPD and to make stakeholders aware of the final steps in the process.

Recording comments

3.24 Comments received online, by email, letter or on paper copies of the relevant response forms were recorded for each stage of consultation. Comments made at the earliest stages of consultation, which related mainly to procedural and evidence gathering matters, have not been made available online. Section 4 of this document does however highlight some of the key issues raised and how we responded to them.

3.25 The outcomes of the early engagement (prior to the Issues and Options consultation) was used to inform the:

- scope of the AONB DPD;
- key issues to be considered in the DPD;
- identification of key local stakeholders;
- stakeholders' roles in the process;
- future community engagement exercises;
- housing need evidence base;
- sites to be considered for development or protection in the DPD;
- SA scope and methodology;
- site assessment methodology.

3.26 Each consultation stage has informed the subsequent drafts of the Plan and thus, the final Plan. Responses to the Issues and Options consultation, consultation on further site suggestions and the Draft Plan have remained available for the public to view online and hard copies are also available to view at SLDC's main offices.

4.0 Key issues raised through engagement process

4.1 This section provides a summary of the key messages from the comments received on the various stages of engagement carried out on the AONB DPD.

Issues and Options Discussion Paper

4.2 Almost 300 responses were made to the Issues and Options Discussion Paper and almost 600 people attended the drop-in events held as part of the consultation. Many people took the time to answer all or some of the consultation questions set out in the Discussion Paper and lots of respondents commented on one or more of the sites that had been put forward for consideration for development or protection. 11 additional sites were put forward for consideration for development and some new open space suggestions were received.

Extra Sites Consultation

4.3 There were 56 respondents to the additional consultation allowing people to comment on the additional site suggestions made through the main consultation.

4.4 A table setting out the comments received at both stages of the Issues and Options Consultation and the Councils' response to them can be found at Appendix 4. A summary of the key issues raised at each drop-in event is provided at Appendix 5.

Draft Plan Consultation and Pre-submission Consultation

4.5 116 responses were made to the Draft Plan consultation and approximately 300 people attended the drop-in events. Comments were received on policy content and proposed sites, including support, objection and changes to some sites. The majority of comments on policy content were general improvements rather than substantive changes. 193 people responded to the pre-publication consultation on three site changes. Together with new and updated evidence, these informed the final Plan for publication.

Housing Needs Survey

4.6 The primary purpose of the Housing Needs Survey was as an evidence gathering exercise to inform decisions on the amount and type of housing the AONB DPD should seek to deliver. A total of 1,473 households responded to the survey. The results of the Survey were set out in a report. Keys findings showed that:

- 167 respondents (11.33%) stated their household or someone living within the household needed to move to another home in the parish within the next 5 years
- 72 respondents in the AONB area are in need of affordable housing within the next 5 years
- The majority of the need is for 1/2 bedroom accommodation for rent, followed by 1/2 bedroom accommodation for intermediate/discounted sale.

- Households in private rented accommodation make up the largest proportion of those in need, many stating that they wish to move/buy or have more security
- There are a large number of adult children, who are living at home with their parents and wish to set up home for the first time.
- Four of the respondents had a preference for sheltered housing.
- A large proportion wish to move as soon as possible.

4.7 Other key issues highlighted through the survey responses included:

- Most people who thought new homes were needed in the AONB felt that the need was mainly for young people, the elderly and small families.
- The majority of people said they would support new homes being built in their parish for local people;
- 95 respondents stated they needed to move but are not deemed to be in need of affordable housing – indicating a demand for housing suitable for a range of different needs, particularly including 2-3 bed and single level properties;
- Some demand for self-build opportunities
- Many people suggested sites where new homes could be built and others gave reasons why they felt no new housing should be built/was needed.

Call for Sites

4.8 The primary purpose of the Call for Sites exercise was to seek suggestions for sites on which new homes, employment and other uses could be built. It also sought suggestions as to sites that should be protected from development, such as important open spaces. 117 sites were put forward. These were primarily sites suggested for housing, although some of the sites were put forward for employment, community and tourism uses. Some sites were put forward by more than one party, sometimes for the same use, sometimes for different uses. Open space sites were only suggested in one parish, so a follow up exercise took place seeking suggestions for open space sites in all the parishes.

Site Assessment Methodology

4.9 27 representations were received in response to consultation on the site assessment methodology. Comments received were generally positive that the issues/factors proposed for assessment were appropriate for the use of assessing the deliverability of sites, but there were a number of very useful suggestions that have been used to amend and improve the site assessment criteria and methodology. Appendix 6 shows the main issues raised from representations that were received and how we responded.

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and draft Sustainability Appraisal Report

4.10 Five representations were made in response to consultation on the draft SA Scoping Report. Comments received were generally positive, supporting the proposed methodology for assessing the suitability and sustainability of policies and sites.

Appendix 7 shows the main issues raised from representations that were received and how we responded.

4.11 Very few representations were made on the draft Sustainability Appraisal Report during Draft Plan consultation.

Stakeholder Meetings

4.12 The Stakeholder Meetings held have all been well attended. At the meetings, Officers from SLDC and Lancaster City Council, made short presentations to update stakeholders regarding the process and progress at each stage, including in relation to the scope of the Plan, Call for Sites process, Site Assessment Methodology, Draft Plan content and on the relevant next steps at each stage of the AONB DPD's preparation and how stakeholders can further engage in the process. At the meetings, there was a generally positive atmosphere and stakeholders welcomed the engagement and the opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

4.13 A workshop with Infrastructure providers was held on 5 July 2016 to discuss AONB-wide and settlement and site-specific infrastructure constraints and opportunities. Although there was limited attendance, some useful information was received. A record of the workshop, including the issues raised, can be found at Appendix 8.

5.0 Next Steps

5.1 This Consultation Statement accompanies formal Publication stage in Autumn 2017. This will be an opportunity to for people to make final, formal representations on the Plan. Representations at this stage are intended to be on fundamental outstanding issues relating to the soundness of the Plan only and will be considered by an Independent Inspector. The expected timetable beyond that is set out below.

Table 6: AONB DPD Timetable

Stage	Timescale
Formal Publication	Autumn 2017
Submission to Secretary of State / Examination	Winter 2017
Adoption	Spring 2018

Appendix 1 - Duty to Co-operate bodies

1. Cumbria County Council
2. Historic England
3. Lake District National Park Authority
4. Natural England
5. Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority
6. Eden District Council
7. Barrow Borough Council
8. Copeland Borough Council
9. Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership
10. Environment Agency
11. Highways England
12. Homes and Communities Agency
13. Lancaster City Council
14. Lancashire County Council
15. Marine Management Organisation
16. North Yorkshire County Council
17. Office of Rail and Road
18. NHS (Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group)
19. Civil Aviation Authority
20. Wyre Borough Council
21. Craven District Council
22. Ribble Valley Borough Council
23. NHS (Lancashire Clinical Commissioning Group)
24. Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership

Appendix 2 - Housing Needs Survey Questionnaire

WARTON PARISH

HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY

By Cumbria Rural Housing Trust

Commissioned by South Lakeland District Council and Lancaster City Council

with support from Arnside & Silverdale AONB Partnership

May/June 2014

.....We need your help!!!

A dedicated Development Plan Document (DPD) is being prepared by South Lakeland District Council and Lancaster City Council for the whole of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Once complete, the DPD will form part of both authorities' Local Plans. It will identify sites for new housing and employment to meet local needs and will set out planning policies to ensure that development reflects the AONB designation.

We must ensure that this important document uses up-to-date evidence, including a local housing needs survey. This survey will help to identify how many new dwellings are needed and of what type. It will also help make policy for future development in the AONB.

To ensure that the housing needs survey produces as accurate an assessment as possible and the most useful evidence, we need you (and as many other local people as possible!) to complete and return the survey.

Please can every household complete Part 1 of the survey.

If anyone in your household is in need of affordable housing now, or in the next five years, please also complete Part 2.

Please return the completed form in the self addressed envelope enclosed by:

Monday 16th June 2014

Thank you in advance for your help.

Information given will be kept strictly confidential by Cumbria Rural Housing Trust under the Data Protection Act.

If you have any questions about the survey contact:
Cumbria Rural Housing Trust, Redhills Business Park, Penrith, Cumbria. CA11 0DT. Tel: 01768 210264

Email: email@crht.org.uk Data Protection Registration Number Z8102236X Charity No. 1064136 Company No. 2920997

Cumbria Rural Housing Trust Housing Needs Survey

WARTON PARISH 2014

Alternative formats are available upon request.

Part 1: Every household should complete this section

1. Please fill in the number of people living in your home

Age	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-39
Male							
Female							
Age	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60-69**	**70-79**	**80-89**	**89+**	
Male							
Female							

• Which of the following describes your household?

❒ Single ❒ Couple
❒ Family - young children ❒ Family – Teenage children
❒ Family - adult children ❒ Other (please explain)

.....

2. What is the tenure of your home?

❒ Own home no mortgage
❒ Own home with mortgage
❒ Rent - Council or Housing Association
❒ Rent from Private Landlord
❒ Shared ownership with Housing Association
❒ Tied accommodation – to job
❒ Live with parents or relatives
Other (please explain)

.....

• **Is this home…?**

❒ Permanent residence ❒ Holiday let
❒ Holiday home ❒ Second Home

3. List the occupations of your household and the average miles travelled to work?

Occupation	*Distance (one way)*

• Does any of your household work from home?

❒ Yes How Many? _____ No ❒

4. How long have you lived in the parish?

..... years.

5. In your view who requires homes in the parish? (tick as many as you want):

❒ Young people ❒ Small families
❒ Large families ❒ Single people
❒ People with disabilities ❒ Elderly people
❒ Self/custom builders ❒ Other (please explain)

.....

❒ No further homes are needed

6. Would you support the construction of new homes in the parish for local people?

❒ Yes ❒ No

• If no, explain your concerns:

.....
.....

7. Potential sites

• Please list sites suitable for housing

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

8. Future housing need in this parish

	Yes	No
• Do you need to move to another home in this parish now or in the next 5 yrs?	❒	❒

If YES please complete part 2 →

	Yes	No
• Does anyone living with you need a separate home in this parish now or in the next 5 yrs?	❒	❒

If YES please complete part 2 →

• How many members of your family have left this parish in the last 5 yrs? ☐

• Please give the reason for leaving.

❒ Lack of affordable housing ❒ Job elsewhere
❒ Lack of public transport ❒ Further education
❒ Marriage/Partnership ❒ Other (please explain)

Warton Housing Needs Survey 47 May/June 2014

For extra survey forms please contact Cumbria Rural Housing Trust.

Part 2: Complete this section if you need another home in the parish now or in the next 5 years.

9. Details of household that needs to move

Age	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-39
Male							
Female							
Age	**40-49**	**50-59**	**60-69**	**70-79**	**80-89**	**89+**	
Male							
Female							

• When are you in need of housing in this Parish?

❒ Now ❒ Within 12 months
❒ Within 3 years ❒ Within 5 years

10. Reasons for housing need

• Why do you need to move? (tick all that apply)

❒ 1 Setting up home for the first time
❒ 2 Couple setting up home together
❒ 3 Present home too small
❒ 4 Present home too large
❒ 5 Present home too expensive
❒ 6 Private tenancy ending shortly
❒ 7 Private tenancy, need more security
❒ 8 In tied housing, need more security
❒ 9 Family breakup
❒ 10 Cannot manage stairs
❒ 11 Present home in poor condition
❒ 12 Renting, but would like to buy
❒ 13 Moved away and wish to return
❒ 14 Disabled, need specially adapted home
❒ 15 To give/receive family support
❒ 16 To be closer to employment
❒ 17 Homeless
❒ 18 Other (please explain)

.....

• Which is the main reason for moving?
Write number .....

11. What are your present housing circumstances?

❒ Own home with no mortgage
❒ Own home with mortgage
❒ Rent from Private Landlord
❒ Rent from Council or Housing Association
❒ Shared ownership with Housing Association
❒ Tied accommodation – to job
❒ Live with parents or relatives
❒ Lodging with another household
❒ Other (please explain)

• What kind of house do you live in (flat, semi-detached, terraced etc)

• How many bedrooms does your home have? .....

• Do you have central heating?

❒ No ❒ Yes, gas
❒ Yes, oil ❒ Yes, electric
❒ Yes, solid fuel

• If no, how is your home heated?

.....

• Do you have double glazing?

❒ Yes ❒ No

• What condition is your home in?

❒ Very good ❒ Good ❒ Fair
❒ Bad ❒ Very bad

•If "bad" or "very bad", please explain why (ie. cold, damp, draughty etc)

The answers in the next section help us assess how much you can afford to pay for new housing. **Any information given in this section Q12 – Q16 will be kept strictly confidential.**

12. Renting

• Do you receive housing benefit?

❒ Yes ❒ No

• If you rent your home how much do you pay each week?

❒ Less than £50 ❒ £51 - £75
❒ £76 - £100 ❒ More than £100

If more than £100 how much do you pay? £.....

13. Home owners

• How much do you think your property is worth?

❒ Less than £75,000 ❒ £75,000-£100,000
❒ £100,000-£125,000 ❒ £125,000-£150,000
❒ £150,000-£175,000 ❒ £175,000-£200,000
❒ £200,000-£250,000 ❒ £250,000-£300,000
❒ £300,000-£350,00 ❒ £350,000-£400,000
❒ £400,000-£450,000 ❒ Over £450,000

• Do you have a mortgage on your current home?

❒ Yes ❒ No

• How much do you owe? £.....

• How long does it have to run? ..... yrs

14. Income

• What is the gross (before tax) combined weekly income for those people who **need to move**.
Income includes wages, pensions & Tax Credits. Do not include Housing Benefit, Child Benefit, Job Seekers Allowance or Council Tax Benefit. (tick one only)

- **If this question not is filled in and you are in housing need, your response cannot be used to help justify the need for affordable housing.**

❒ Under £100	❒ £101-£150	❒ £151-£200
❒ £201-£250	❒ £251-£300	❒ £301-£350
❒ £351-£400	❒ £401-£450	❒ £451-£500
❒ £501-£550	❒ £551-£600	❒ £601-£650
❒ £651-£700	❒ £701-£750	❒ £750-£800
❒ £800-£850	❒ £851-£900	❒ £900+

15. Do you have any savings that could be used to buy a home?

❒ No savings	❒ Under £5k	❒ £5k - £10k
❒ £10k - £20k	❒ £20k - £30k	❒ Over £30k

If over £30k, please state amount: £.....

Please do not include any equity from your home. This is covered in Q 13.

16. How many people who need to move are in the following types of employment?

No.	Occupation type
	Working full time
	Working part time
	Unemployed and seeking work
	Unemployed and not seeking work
	Retired
	In full time further/higher education
	Other (please explain)

• List the occupations of **those needing to move** and the average miles travelled to work.

Occupation	*Distance (one way)*
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

• Do any of **those needing to move** work from home?

❒ Yes How Many? ..... No ❒

• In which villages/towns do they work?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

• How long have they worked in each place?

	Less 1 yr	1-3 yrs	3-5 yrs	5+ yrs
1.	❒	❒	❒	❒
2.	❒	❒	❒	❒
3.	❒	❒	❒	❒
4.	❒	❒	❒	❒

17. What type of home do you need?

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 +
House	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Bungalow	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒
Flat	❒	❒	❒	❒	❒

Other (please explain)

.....

	Yes	No
• Are you registered with Choice Based Lettings/Council register?	❒	❒
• Are you registered on any local Private Landlord waiting list?	❒	❒

• Does anyone **needing to move** require:

❒ Access for wheelchair	❒ Accommodation on one level
❒ Sheltered housing	❒ Help with personal care
❒ Extra Care housing	

• Please tell us more about any health or mobility problems.

_____
_____
_____

• Which would best suit your housing need?

❒ Renting	❒ Buying on open market
❒ Residential care	❒ Shared ownership
❒ Sheltered housing	❒ Self-build/custom build
❒ Extra Care housing	❒ Other (please explain)

.....

• Do you feel there is a lack of suitable existing housing to meet your needs? ❒ Yes ❒ No

• If in a position to buy your own home, what could you afford?

❒ Under £75,000	❒ £75,000-£100,000
❒ £100,000-£125,000	❒ £125,000-£150,000
❒ £150,000-£175,000	❒ £175,000-£200,000
❒ £200,000-£250,000	❒ £300,000+

If more than £300,000, please state amount: £.....

18. Where would you like to live?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

• Please give the reasons for your first choice.

- ❒ I was born/grew up in this Parish
- ❒ I live in this Parish now
- ❒ I am currently employed in this Parish and I have been employed here for…..... years

If employed in parish only, where do you live now?

.....

- ❒ I have close family ties in this Parish
- ❒ I need to move to take up employment in this Parish
- ❒ Other (please explain)

• What is the furthest away would you be prepared to move?

❒ 5-10 miles ❒ 10-20 miles ❒ 20-30 miles
❒ 30-40 miles ❒ 40-50 miles ❒ 50+ miles

• Are you a former resident of this Parish who needs to return?

❒ Yes ❒ No

• If yes, how long did you live in the parish?.....yrs

• If yes, how long ago did you leave?..... yrs

• If yes, reason for leaving.

- ❒ Lack of affordable housing
- ❒ Lack of employment opportunities
- ❒ Lack of effective public transport system
- ❒ To take up further/higher education
- ❒ Other (please explain)

Contact details - optional

We may need to contact you for more information about your needs. Information will be kept strictly confidential by Cumbria Rural Housing Trust under the Data Protection Act. Your name and address will not be passed on to any other party.

Name:	Address: Postcode:
Tel:	Email:

Comments/further info:

Thank you

Thank you on behalf of Cumbria Rural Housing Trust for taking the time to complete the survey. Please return in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope.

CLOSING DATE: **Monday 16th June 2014**

If you have any questions about the survey contact:
Cumbria Rural Housing Trust, Redhills Business Park, Penrith, Cumbria. CA11 0DT. Tel: 01768 210264

Email: email@crht.org.uk Data Protection Registration Number Z810236X Charity No. 1064136 Company No. 2920997

Appendix 3 - Call for Sites Site Suggestion Form

Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Development Plan Document
CALL FOR SITES – SITE SUGGESTION FORM

Please use this form to suggest a site to be considered for housing, affordable housing, employment, community use or other development, or for locally important open space.

Please suggest **one site only per form**.

In order to be considered, sites **must**:

- be within the Arnside and Silverdale AONB;
- not overlap with any local, national or international wildlife or geology designation;
- not be subject to any extant planning permissions for the use or type of development proposed.

You do not need to be the owner of a site in order to suggest it but suggestions **must** be accompanied by:

- a **location map** clearly and accurately showing the outline **in red** of the land being proposed;
- details of **what type(s) of development you believe the site to be suitable for** (housing, employment, mixed-use, open space, community uses or infrastructure);
- written **confirmation that the landowner is willing to make the site available** for development/use proposed – wherever possible, this should be from / signed by the landowner;
- **contact details of the landowner** (including copies of the Land Registry report/deeds if possible);
- details of **any known covenants on the land**.

It is expected that smaller sites are likely to be most appropriate in the AONB. There may be instances where a portion of a site is appropriate for development even if the whole site is not.

If a site meets the criteria but some of the information is missing from your form, we may contact you seeking these missing details. This may delay the process – please ensure you include as much information as possible. If you have any queries about suggesting a site and submitting accompanying information, please contact 01539 793383 (for South Lakeland) or 01524 582335 (for Lancaster).

More copies of this form can be found online (on South Lakeland's, Lancaster's or the AONB websites – see bottom of form), or you can request additional forms from developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk or by calling 01539 793383 (for South Lakeland) or 01524 582335 (for Lancaster) or collect a form from council or AONB offices.

Your suggestions should be sent to developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk by **Friday 27th February 2015**. Alternatively, send them to Development Plans, South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 4DL. **Once submitted, your suggestions will be available for others to view.**

1. Personal Details		**2. Agent Details** (if applicable)	
Title		Title	
First Name		First Name	
Last Name		Last Name	
Job Title (where relevant)		Job Title (where relevant)	
Organisation (where relevant)		Organisation (where relevant)	
Address Line 1		Address Line 1	
Line 2		Line 2	
Line 3		Line 3	
Line 4		Line 4	
Post Code		Post Code	
Telephone Number		Telephone Number	
Email address		Email address	

3. I am… (tick as many as are applicable)	
Owner of the site ☐	Planning Consultant ☐
Parish Council ☐	Land Agent ☐
Local Resident ☐	Developer ☐
Amenity/Community Group ☐	Registered Social Landlord ☐
Other (please specify)	

4. Site Information	
Site location (address and post code)	
Grid reference (centre of site)	
Site area (hectares)	
Current Land Use e.g. agriculture, employment, unused/vacant etc.	
Greenfield/brownfield (has it ever been built on before?)	
Existing trees and other landscape features on the site	
Availability of access to the site (roads, footpaths)	
Ecological features and areas of biological importance	
Relevant Planning History (if known – please include relevant planning application numbers)	
Please explain how the development of this site will have a positive impact on the AONB.	

Why is the development of this site appropriate in the context of the AONB?	
If the whole site is not allocated, is there a smaller portion of it that would be appropriate? (if yes, please indicate this area on your map in another colour)	

5. Proposed Use – what do you propose the site could be used for?		
USE (if mixed use, please tick all that apply)	**Yes**	**Basic Information** – area/number of units/proposed Floorspace
Residential/housing	☐	
Community facilities (please specify)	☐	
Locally Important Open space	☐	
Employment/business use	☐	
Other (please specify)	☐	

6. Site Ownership		
I (or my client)….		
am the sole owner of the site	☐	
am a part owner of the site	☐	
do not own (or hold any legal interest in) the site whatsoever	☐	
If you are the owner/part-owner have you attached a copy of the title plan and deeds with this form?	Yes ☐	No ☐
If you are not the owner, or own only part of the site, do you know who owns or has an interest in the site /remainder? (please provide details):		
Does the owner(s) support your proposal for the site?	Yes ☐	No ☐
If you only own part of the site, please indicate on the map you are providing which part of the site you own and other ownerships affecting the site.		

7. Market Interest (if known)		
Please choose the most appropriate category below and indicate what level of market interest there is/has recently been in the site.		
	Yes	**Comments** (please give details where known)
Site is owned by a developer	☐	
Site is under option to a developer	☐	
Enquiries received	☐	
Site is being marketed	☐	
None	☐	
Not Known	☐	

8. Utilities (if known)			
Please tell us which of the following utilities are available to the site			
	Yes	**No**	**Unsure**
Mains water supply	☐	☐	☐
Mains sewerage	☐	☐	☐
Electrical supply	☐	☐	☐
Gas supply	☐	☐	☐
Public highway	☐	☐	☐
Landline telephone/broadband internet	☐	☐	☐
Public Transport	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):			

9. Availability Issues			
Please tell us if there are any of the following constraints			
	Yes	**No**	**Unsure**
Land in other ownerships is needed in order to develop the site	☐	☐	☐
There are restrictive covenants on the site	☐	☐	☐
The current use of the site needs to be relocated for the site to be developed	☐	☐	☐
There are physical constraints (topography, trees, other)	☐	☐	☐
Public rights of way cross or adjoin the site	☐	☐	☐
There may be/are issues of contamination affecting the site	☐	☐	☐
The site is in or near a Conservation Area or Listed Buildings	☐	☐	☐
The site is in an area of flood risk	☐	☐	☐
Please provide any relevant information of likely measures to address any of the above that you have answered "YES" to:			

10. Timescale for Availability		
Please indicate the approximate timescale for availability:		
		Comments – particularly if you have indicated that the site is not immediately available, please explain why:
Immediately	☐	
Up to 5 years	☐	
5 - 10 years	☐	
10 – 15 years	☐	
Beyond 15 years	☐	

11. Other Relevant Information – Please use the space below for additional information or further explanations on any of the topics covered in this form (any additional info should be limited to 1 side of A4 paper):

12. In summary, why do you think development of this site would be sustainable in the context of the Arnside and Silverdale AONB? By sustainable development, we mean development that is close to key services and facilities and not causing harm to the environmental, social or economic objectives of the AONB. In particular, sites should not compromise the primary purpose of AONB designation, which is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area.

Signature.....**Date**.....

PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU HAVE ENCLOSED A MAP OUTLINING THE SITE IN RED AND THE EXTENT OF EACH KNOWN OWNERSHIP

ALL SITE SUGGESTIONS, INCLUDING THOSE THAT LIE WITHIN LANCASTER DISTRICT, SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk

www.southlakeland.gov.uk www.lancaster.gov.uk/planning/local-plan

www.arnsidesilverdaleaonb.org.uk

Appendix 4 – Summary of responses to Issues and Options and Extra Sites Consultations

See separate document.

Appendix 5 – Summary of responses to Draft Plan and Pre-Publication Consultations

See separate documents.

Appendix 6 - Main issues raised at Issues and Options Stage Drop-in Events

Storth – 74 attendees

- Most people had queries about specific sites and/or the process/next steps.
- Concern expressed about access to sites along Quarry Lane.
- Concern about possible scale of development on site B79, N of Yans Lane.
- Support for the development of business uses at sites B35 and B81, and for the potential to improve pedestrian safety along the main road (B5282).
- Clarification with owners about the correct boundary for site B114, E of Carr Bank Road.

Warton – 119 attendees

- Warton is heavily constrained by flood risk, geology, landscape, and capacity of the Carnforth doctors' surgery.
- More development would exacerbate existing highway problems on Main Road (over-parked so virtually impassable), Borwick Lane (dangerous and liable to flooding) and Mill Lane (lack of footpath), especially as there is a lack of employment opportunities in the AONB meaning people have to commute out of the area to get to work.
- Warton has already provided more than its fair share of housing (Millhead and Warton Grange Farm), so there will be no housing need for Warton for a number of years to come.
- Lots of suggestions for development of brownfield sites in Carnforth, including Lundsfield Quarry and TDG site – suggested these should be looked at INSTEAD of the AONB/Warton.
- Concern that if housing is provided within the AONB that it should be starter / affordable homes of an appropriate size – not executive homes or second homes.
- There was some confusion about the status of sites shown on the maps/plans as some of the sites had planning permission, whilst most were merely suggestions by landowners.
- Concerns of an existing conflict of interest between the Parish Council and the main local landowners who are promoting most of the large sites around Warton (i.e. a strong feeling that the Parish Council does not reflect the opinions of the local population).
- Some praise for consulting residents so early in the process – they had expected the final plan to be tabled.
- Some specific comments raised about particular sites – surface water run-off from Warton Crag was mentioned a lot as was the lack of suitable vehicular access to the land south of Sand Lane (W92 and 93).
- Some residents had done calculations as to what they thought the total number of houses expected to be build might be based on the need identified in the Housing Needs Survey for c70 affordable units in the next 5 years, the fact that this will be a 15 year plan (so potentially a need for c210), and the fact that Millhead (a greenfield site) could only deliver 30% and as a result were concerned for the implications the totals they had reached might have on the natural beauty of the AONB, its limited road

network and whether this would make the area less attractive to tourists/visitors (so adversely impacting on the local economy)
- Many people pointed out the current flooding problems and could not understand how housing could be considered in such areas.
- The brownfield sites in Carnforth were mentioned many times and people felt it was wrong for these sites to be left unused whilst greenfield sites were lost within the AONB.
- No feedback was provided on the questions set out by the discussion paper.

Silverdale – 137 attendees

- Many people had general queries or concerns about specific sites and/or the process/next steps.
- The well-documented sewage system issues were raised but more people had general infrastructure/community facilities concerns (library, bus service, shop, traffic issues, school etc.) than specifically mains sewerage concerns but equally, people recognised that new homes and a few more people might help keep such services viable.
- Many people mentioned the need for smaller homes for singles, elderly, couple, small/young families and specifically stated there is no need for more larger 4/5+ bedroomed properties in the area.
- Some people asked about overall numbers of houses to be delivered in Silverdale and the AONB more widely.
- Several people were confused about how the process/sites shown related to the District-wide process in Lancaster and sites they had seen tabled at a similar event in Carnforth.
- Several people had concerns about what happens to public rights of way if development takes place on sites that PRoW cross.
- Several people had particular concerns about the tracts of land identified both east and west of Lindeth Road, including behind Whinney Fold.
- Feedback on the day indicated that sites at Elmslack Field (S43), Hawthorn Bank (S45) and East of St. John's Avenue (S50) are unavailable; land north of Woodlands Cottage (site S51) and adjoining land may be proposed as a revised site suggestion by the landowner.

Arnside – 117 attendees

- Recognition that the sites are just what has been suggested to us at this stage and not sites that we are proposing to allocate.
- Most queries / discussions were about individual sites or groups of sites.
- Established that Land NW of Briery Bank (A14: or at least a significant part of) and Land East of Carr Bank Road (B114: in whole) are not available.
- Several people (in a group) questioned the availability of the site at Hollins Lane (A8) and it became apparent that there is some confusion over who the owners are and whether they are willing to release it.
- Some praise for the approach to preparing a plan focused on the AONB area, especially in terms of achieving consistency of policies, more of a focus on the AONB designation and the two councils working together across the boundary.

- Significant concern about development on key sites such as Redhills Road (site A15), Briery Bank fields (sites A11/12 and 107) and Station Fields (sites A23/24).
- Particular concern about large site off Knott Lane (A7) and the coastal site at Far Arnside (A2).
- Transport links are not good enough to support an increased population, as people generally work/shop/go to school etc. outside the area. Narrow roads are already busy and dangerous and cannot cope with further increases in numbers of car journeys - this is not sustainable.
- General feeling from many people that their view regarding the suitability for development of any given site depends **how** a site is developed - if a combination of small scale sensitive development and creation /retention of open space could be achieved on a site this may be more likely to attract support from the local community, especially if it was a new public open space such as park or village green for example.
- Some concern about 'creep' of development happening over time impacting on the rural nature of the village, for example, small portions of a bigger area of land being developed consecutively.
- Support for a station car park and other improvements at Station Yard site (sites A25/26/27) – expressed as being preferable to a new car park at Station Field (site A22).
- Concern about flooding of Station Field site (A22) and flooding in Storth cutting off the village at high tides with increasing frequency.
- Most people work outside the AONB, so that is where new houses are needed - any development in the AONB should be affordable and local needs only.
- General support for development and improvement of brownfield sites, particularly Station Yard (A25/26/27).
- Overall a positive and constructive dialogue.

Beetham – 69 attendees

- Questions about the need for housing locally, but general view that a small amount would be welcome.
- Concerns in particular about the larger site in the village (B32) and the sites at Slackhead (B73/74/75/76).
- Sites at Slackhead generally thought to be wholly unsuitable (mainly due to access, proximity to services and facilities and impact on rural feel of area).
- Impact on neighbours of the larger site in Beetham (B32) who have a responsibility in their deeds for the maintenance of the lane leading to the site – what would happen to this responsibility?
- Larger site considered too big (B32).
- Some indication that a smaller part of B32 (such as area proposed for car park) would be OK.
- Questions about proposed car park on part of B32 and how this relates to/could set a precedent for housing to be allowed.
- Parking issues in the village.
- Questions about the crematorium decision (which at the time was an outstanding appeal decision that has now been decided, allowing the appeal).

- Suggestion that things like housing provision should just be left to the market rather than trying to 'engineer society'
- Concerns about lack of jobs/infrastructure locally and that housing would be better placed closer to services and facilities.
- Some positive reactions to the smaller sites.
- Several people expressed their concerns about B73 having toxic waste on the site and B76 and B74 being partly covered by Limestone Pavement Orders.
- Concerns expressed about the impact of new development on the very narrow roads in Beetham and towards Slackhead.

Yealands – 76 attendees

- Land East of Yealand Road (Y99) – queries as to availability.
- Land N and E of The Meadows (Y100) – considered too large, access considered to be a major constraint, concern that owner not willing to release land, flooding issues.
- Land North and East of Silverdale Road (Y101/Y102) – some concern about impact on long views and potential for joining up Yealand Redmayne with Yealand Storrs.
- Land West of Footeran Lane (Y103) - some concern about potential for joining up Yealand Redmayne with Yealand Conyers, considered too large, access onto narrow road considered unsuitable, small part of land subject to a covenant preventing development.
- Many people with concerns relating to traffic issues in nearby Warton
- Comment that Land at Town End Farm in Warton (W96) has the wrong boundary and parts of site are not available.
- General queries about the need for development locally, lack of services and facilities in the villages.
- Concerns about capacity of roads such as Nineteen Acre Road (which are being used as 'rat runs' to the A6 and M6) to take additional traffic.
- Drainage/managing water coming down off the crag was raised as an issue.

Appendix 7 – Main issues raised at Draft Plan Stage Drop-in Events

Storth – 24 Attendees

- Most people expressed support for the combined mixed-use proposals.
- One person expressed concern that any houses built on the site would be too removed from the village, but others disagreed, stating that actually it was well–connected and very much part of the village.
- A small number of people expressed concern about the likelihood of the whole of Quarry Lane being upgraded into a highway.
- Some people suggested that the Key Settlement Landscape designation north of Yans Lane should be extended east.
- Most people seemed content with the open space/KSL designations.
- The owner of site B35 said that the site would not flood and should be considered for residential development.

Warton – 79 Attendees

- Many people had concerns regarding the demolition of the dwelling on site W130 - considered to be of local heritage significance: Carnforth railway manager's house possibly with granite facing brought down from Scotland on the railway, dated late 1800s? One person said information was available on MARIO regarding the house. Also, it appears to be identified as a listed building in the SA.
- A couple of people asked whether there could not be a different access to site W130, further to the west. One lady challenged the landscape assessment which says that the site is concealed by the existing residential properties. She considered that approaching from Millhead you can see the roofs of the existing houses on Church Hill Avenue and will therefore see the new ones, and also from Main Street if the existing dwelling is demolished.
- Surface water and flooding issues along Main Street to the south of Church Hill Avenue towards Sand Lane were raised by a number of people. Problems have been exacerbated by recent development.
- Current traffic issues on Main Street identified by several people.
- Expansion of housing in Warton but no expansion of services/facilities such as footpaths, lighting along Mill Lane.
- Warton already expanded greatly over the years in a linear pattern with modern housing along Sand Lane and Main Street and the village has changed a lot. Concerns expressed regarding further expansion and possible merging Warton with Carnforth through Millhead.
- Already permission granted for new housing at Warton Grange Farm and Mill head - why more?
- Should not be any further development of Warton up the slopes of Warton Crag.
- There was support for Key Settlement Landscapes but several people thought there should be more in Warton to prevent further development up the slopes of the Crag.
- Persimmon Homes - were disappointed that only site A11 had come forward. They wanted to develop a much larger area of that field in **Arnside**. 14 houses were too

many for this site if development needed to reflect the local character - 3 storey buildings would be required and the existing screening partly removed.

- A family from **Arnside** that live near A11 had similar concerns about the number of houses proposed for A11 but did not object to the development in principle- they also had concerns about whether the housing would be affordable.
- Landowner of A9 in **Arnside** confirmed that he would be unlikely to support proposal as currently set out but advised that an alternative portion of the site would be favourable – suggested alternative included opening up views and ensuring that the remaining land was put to use for public open space with a biodiversity element – will make submission to this effect.
- Concern that proposed developments would set a precedent for further development beyond.
- Concern that proposed developments would cause greater run-off and flooding to nearby properties at a lower level.
- There were some people who were happy to see that several sites were now out of consideration and actually felt that the two remaining were sensible options that reflected the linear nature of the village, particularly in their reduced size.
- Concerns that these new developments wouldn't preclude further development in the future.
- Concerns about whether the houses would be genuinely affordable / for locals.
- Concerns re capacity of local roads and school, lack of other services.

Silverdale – 73 Attendees

- Most people objected outright to any development to the rear of the existing Whinney Fold – many could not understand how other sites had been ruled out of the process that they felt were less sensitive, when this one had remained in.
- A small number of those that did not object outright felt that either that the site should be smaller to better reflect the existing building line or that the number should be increased as 6 houses on that size of site would be a low density and would result in large properties, which are not what is needed locally.
- A family/trustees of a site attended saying that the person who had withdrawn S50 did not have the right to do so and expressed that they may wish to re-submit it or part of it.
- Several people challenged the very idea of any new development taking place in an AONB/on greenfield sites/on greenfield sites in an AONB.
- Some people identified that there is a housing need in Silverdale but that it is for smaller homes, not large, luxury dwellings.
- Several people expressed support for the mixed-use proposal close to Silverdale Station.
- Some people said that they would support the proposed mixed-use site near Silverdale Station being used for housing development instead of employment.
- Several people challenged previous planning decisions in Silverdale and were worried about the likelihood of the proposed 6 dwelling setting a precedent for more in the future.
- One lady expressed that she works in Silverdale, currently lives in Lancaster and wants to find affordable housing in the village.

- Most people seemed content with the open space/KSL designations
- A number of people, when discussing their objections to Whinney Fold, challenged some previous planning permissions granted in Silverdale on sites they considered to be far more suitable for development than Whinney Fold but which were for large, detached dwellings and not be meeting local affordable need. Kaye's garden centre and tea room, both brownfield sites, were mentioned.
- A couple of people also expressed concern about the Hawthorn Bank application - not meeting local need and in open countryside.
- Redevelopment of the Leeds Children's Holiday Camp at Silverdale was another issue raised by a number of people. The scale of the existing caravan site (350 static caravans and 50 tourers) and the need for more, extension beyond the existing site, and the impact of new caravans in this coastal location were points raised. Two people also mentioned rumours that land to the west of the holiday camp site was also being purchased by Holgate's and were concerned that development would then extend further along the coast - gradual, incremental development and cumulative change.
- A number of local residents to Whinney Fold identified access to the site as a key constraint, particularly in terms of determining the number of properties to be constructed.
- Car parking issues onto Shore Road noted to be an issue, again relating to accessing the Whinney Fold site.
- Car Parking issues were also discussed more generally in the village and suggested to be a problem – the main causes identified as people visiting the village (both the surrounding coastline and the facilities in the village such as the pub). No specific solutions offered but an area of off-street parking in the centre of the village would be supported.
- Some people expressed concern about the inadequacy of the waste water infrastructure in Silverdale, and the need to prevent any further development until the management waste water treatment is improved.

Arnside – 60 Attendees

- **See comments made re Arnside at Warton event.**
- General support for the Station Yard site and its proposed uses.
- Few people recommended that Station Fields should be used for parking instead of Station Yard.
- Several people pleased to see that Redhills Road site/the common now proposed for protection.
- Concerns about Hollins Lane site re traffic/access and impact on immediate neighbours/ closing off the site – pointless to keep remainder as open space if blocking it off.
- Green space designations of both types generally supported.
- Question as to why land further down Briery Bank (A14/A107) was considered less suitable than other sites.
- Question why green space designation A107 covers parts of gardens on southern end of Briery Bank –why people's gardens and also why only half the gardens?
- Suggestion that land east of Black Dyke Road / north of High Black Dyke Farm should also be protected as KSL.

- Suggestion that land around Saltcotes Hall should be protected as KSL since land around Hill House is.
- Concerns about A11 putting extra traffic and parked cars on Briery Bank since the residents of the recently built affordable homes next to A11 do not used their dedicated car park and instead park on the road.
- Some people expressed a need for older peoples' housing to be developed in Arnside rather than just the small sites for standard dwellings as proposed.
- Concerns around type, size and affordability of housing likely to be developed on the sites.
- One person was very critical of the map key – felt that the word 'Housing', 'Mixed Use' etc. was misleading and did not convey the right meaning; the alternative suggested was something along the lines of 'proposed housing / housing allocation etc.
- One person expressed grave reservations about possibility of Conservation Area in Arnside.
- People seemed supportive of the policies and proposed allocations being brought forward, in particular the notion of Key Settlement Landscape (although the designation did need a bit of explaining).
- A couple stated that the boundary of A11 is incorrectly drawn and includes land in their ownership / ownership of Hill House – agreed to send in amended boundary.

Beetham – 16 Attendees

- General support for the modest amount of new development proposed in Beetham, with a query as to whether Church Street was wide enough to serve this site.
- Enquiry about why the sports field in Beetham has not been identified as an open space use (it is a temporary use), and why Site B117 is not included in the main development site at Sandside (it is pasture, and development would have an impact on the landscape that could not be mitigated).
- Enquiry on behalf of the owners about Site B33 concerning allocation of land for caravan site expansion at Hall More (excluded because of priority habitat).
- Significant on-going concern about the approval of the crematorium on appeal - the crematorium is a significant issue for local residents and many are very frustrated that it was permitted. It is considered to be very inappropriate in this location - its appearance and the traffic implications on the A6 were specifically mentioned. Also comments were made that a crematorium near Kendal is what is needed, Beetham is too close to the existing crematorium at Lancaster. The view of a number of people was that this decision illustrated that the AONB designation carries no weight.
- Comment that the school is oversubscribed at present as it's very popular (this comment was made in relation to an officer comment about small levels of development in villages helping support rural services).
- Concerns raised that there has been other very inappropriate development in Hale - the chalet style house was highlighted and also the proposals at Rose Villa.
- Designated wildlife sites and other designations within the AONB were flagged up as being very important in the area and that their protection must be ensured.

Yealands – 16 Attendees

- Some attendees were pleased to learn that no allocations were being made in the Yealands or that specific sites proposed earlier had not been taken forward.
- Some attendees were landowners/landowners' family members who were disappointed to see that their site(s) had not been taken forward - some challenged the assessment process.
- Some attendees felt that some land should be allocated for development in the Yealands to enable young people wanting to stay in the village as they grow up to do so / to otherwise meet local housing needs.

Appendix 8 - Main issues raised about the Site Assessment Methodology and how we responded

Table 5: Main issues raised on the Site Assessment Methodology	
Main issue raised	**Council Response**
Priority species should be included within the Exclusion Criteria	-ve Priority species cannot be used as an exclusion criteria. This is because of the presentation format of the data on priority species, which means that it is only possible to relate species presence to very large areas and as a result, all land is shown to have priority species present. Ecological assessments would be needed to determine actual presence of particular species, including priority species, on any given site and will be a significant factor is assessing suitability of the site at a later stage in the process.
Limestone Pavement Orders should be specifically listed within the Exclusion Criteria	+ve The Site Assessment Methodology now includes Limestone Pavement Orders as an Exclusion Criteria
Impact on public access needs to be included within the Suitability Criteria	+ve The Site Assessment Methodology now includes impact on public access needs as Suitability Criteria
Traffic implications need to be included as part of the deliverability criteria	+ve The Site Assessment Methodology includes the potential impact on public access needs which includes roads as an Suitability Criteria
Amenity value and important local green spaces should be included as Exclusion Criteria	+ve The Site Assessment Methodology includes existing or recent recreational or community use, with no appropriate replacement as an exclusion criteria.
Suitability/Sustainability criteria should include Open Access Land and Common Land	+ve The Site Assessment Methodology includes Open Access Land and Common Land falls under the category of Open Green Space.
The distance criteria of 400m walking distance and 100m to services are considered overly restrictive.	-ve The Site Assessment Methodology distance criteria of 400m walking distance and 100m to services are considered to be a sustainable development criteria.

Appendix 9 - Main issues raised about the draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and how we responded

Main issue raised	Council Response
Recommend the inclusion of a measure to look for opportunities to undertake habitat creation to compensate for the impacts of climate change.	+ve
Adopt an 'early intervention' strategy for new infestations of invasive non-native as an objective.	+ve
Therefore, SA Objective 15 should be amended to ensure that they reflect national policy and Legislation and the terminology of the NPPF.	+ve
Recommend that HRA is undertaken as soon as possible to inform the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process.	+ve
Air Quality should be included within the scope of the SA.	+ve
Recreational pressure should be considered as in issue on Morecambe Bay.	+ve

Appendix 10 – Record of Workshop with Infrastructure Providers

Arnside & Silverdale AONB DPD
Infrastructure Providers Workshop

Tuesday 5th July 2016 – Lancaster Town Hall LA1 1PJ

Invitees

- Lucy Barron, Arnside & Silverdale AONB
- Michael Macklin, B4YS
- Paul Latham, Cumbria Constabulary
- Doug Coyle, Cumbria County Council
- Michael Barry, Cumbria County Council
- Sue Brett, Cumbria County Council
- Sir/Madam, Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service
- Corrine Watson, Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership
- Graham Jackson-Pitt, Cumbria Local Nature Partnership
- Ian Povey, Electricity North West Ltd
- Dave Hortin, Environment Agency
- Lindsay Alder, Highways England
- Emily Hrycan, Historic England
- Dave Vickers, Lancashire Constabulary
- Tim Ellams, Lancashire Constabulary
- Terry Burke, Lancashire Constabulary
- Paul Blakeley, Lancashire County Council
- Steph Rhodes, Lancashire County Council
- Mike Doran, Lancashire County Council
- David Goode, Lancashire County Council
- Ashley Weir, Lancashire County Council
- Steve Scott, Lancashire County Council
- Brad Walker, Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service
- Ray Cassar, Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service
- Kathryn Molloy, Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership
- Helen Ryan, Lancaster City Council
- Paul Cartmell, Lancaster City Council
- Susannah Bleakley, Morecambe Bay Local Nature Partnership
- Sir/Madam, National Grid Gas Distribution
- Sir/Madam, Natural England
- Diane Clarke, Network Rail
- Jill Stephenson, Network Rail
- Julie Clayton, NHS (Cumbria Clinical Commissioning Group)
- Hilary Fordham, NHS (Lancashire Clinical Commissioning Group)
- Sir/Madam, North West Ambulance Service
- Heidi Mottram, Northern Rail
- Sean Hall, SLDC Environmental Protection
- Deborah Clarke, SLDC Open Spaces
- Bryan McFarland, Stagecoach
- Michael Sanderson, Stagecoach
- Sir/Madam, United Utilities
- Dave Sherratt, United Utilities

Attendees

- Lucy Barron, Arnside & Silverdale AONB
- Alan McNicoll, Cumbria County Council
- Graeme Innes, Cumbria County Council
- Colin Parkes, Cumbria County Council
- Liz Locke, Environment Agency
- David Goode, Lancashire County Council
- Janet Baguley, Natural England
- Elizabeth Knowles, Natural England
- Willie McPhail, Stagecoach

Discussion

Table 1

Problems:

- (NE) Functionally linked land
    - Spa
    - Similar issues as with LCC plan
- (NE + AONB) Robust ecological network is crucial special quality of AONB – plan should enhance – net gains.
- (NE) Plan should set out special qualities.
- (AONB/LCC) Bus services 'doomed' / under threat.
- Not all trains stop in AONB stations.
- Station shuttle important.
- (LCC) Residential development - roads not able to accommodate pedestrians + cars together.
- (AONB) Car Park @ S70 could result in cutting shuttle bus as would discourage use.
- (LCC + AONB) Speed limits naturally low due to nature of roads – enforcement would be an issue if formal limit – would add more visually intrusive signage – signage design could help.
- Caravans / static movements - Result in a constraint in terms of road capacity – DPD caravan sites policy should take into account.
- (EA) Expansion of caravan sites needs to be very carefully monitored / controlled due to lack of mains sewage system. Physical expansion of caravan numbers, and any change in pattern of usage i.e. from holiday to residential use. Similar issue applies with farm diversification converting barns etc. to residential or holiday accommodation – can lead to overloading existing septic tank infrastructure unless this is upgraded as part of the development.
- (EA) Discharges – impacts on designated Shellfish Waters in Morecambe Bay– extra layer of water quality control this is specifically regarding bacterial contamination, e.g. from sewage.
- (EA) Silverdale – very vulnerable ground water – care required when considering surface water management of new carpark at Silverdale Station (although the EA no-longer routinely provides comments on surface water management)
- (EA) Silverdale – existing impacts of septic tank infra not fully known.
- (EA) Caravan sites – septic tank infra is already overloaded.
- (EA) S70 – very tight controls needed regarding drainage
- (EA) However SuDs where vulnerable aquifers need alternative – keep out of aquifer.
- (EA) Flood risk on e.g. Station Yard needs looking at but not show stopper.
- (EA) Sites that flooded in Storm Desmond are being classed as FZ3 (not yet re-drawn maps) – no new modelling currently proposed.
- (EA) No asset programmes in area.
- (AONB/EA) Leighton Moss SSSI in unfavourable condition due to water quality / diffuse pII^n / septic tank seepage – implications when there are flood events.
- (EA) Septic tank condition (aged etc.) = leaks.
- (AONB) B39 – part priority habitat – double check, should be ruled out?

LCC Public Realm Development Manager: Due to issues of remoteness, access to public open space in terms of play areas, young people facilities and amenity space for informal play, which often doubles up as an area for community activities, is important in rural areas.

- LCC Public Realm Development Manager: The ideal would be for all villages within the area to offer such facilities and any developments in these areas to contribute towards the ongoing quality of such facilities.
- LCC Public Realm Development Manager: There is a lack of young people's facilities in these areas. These can include; age specific pieces of equipment(usually more challenging for this age group); climbing walls/boulder; Multi Use Games areas; BMX tracks; Skate areas; teen shelters, etc.

Opportunities

- Need to encourage sustainable modes of travel by making new footways.
- (LCC) Quality walking / cycling routes to encourage sustainable travel
- Remove stiles to encourage footpath use.
- Footpath bypasses where there are pinch points.
- (AONB) Yealand - school in between 2 settlements – need footpath.
- Sandside – Footpaths needed around proposed sites.
- (AONB) Need to reduce no of cars on roads by encouraging alternatives, reducing car journeys.
- (EA) SuDs – hard SuDs not preferred anyway but sometimes best/only option.
- (EA/NE) SuDs need to be carefully designed in AONB + contribute to AONB objectives.
- (AONB) – AONB Management plan – should guide priorities for infra monies investment.
- (AONB) Sites suitable for housing should be used for the type of houses that are actually needed, otherwise, we'll always need more sites to meet the need + the more sensitive sites will have to be used as all the suitable sites will have been used up.
- (AONB + NE) HSG – RSLS – deliver what's needed + enhancing rather than using up the suitable sites for market / large homes – enhancing = habitat creation, biodiversity networks etc.
- (AONB/NE) Policy framework (not just funding) important to deliver AONB Management plan objectives through DPD.
- (AONB/NE) Policies to direct funding in future e.g. Star on map to highlight the areas we'd like to see it directed to.
- (AONB/NE) CIL priority in AONB should include ecological / GI enhancement inc for community benefit.
- (AONB/NE) IDP AONB section – list AONB priorities for CIL spending.
- (AONB) A9 Hollins Lane – open space should be created on part of the site not developed. Recognising former rec use.

Table 2

Problems:

- Flood risk issues on a number of sites.
- Lack of main sewerage in Silverdale – careful management of situation.

- Same regarding localised highways issues e.g. particular difficult junctions in villages but no real strategic problem given scale of development.
- Lack of functional public transport network – not commercially viable and no prospect of commercial services or increased subsides. Agree that the public transport network within the AONB is poor. The 552 bus timetable (unlike the shuttle bus and route 51 at Silverdale) certainly does not provide an integrated network with the rail timetable. Also, to get from one side of the AONB to the other (e.g. Sandside to Warton), a traveller must catch a bus, a train and another bus. What would be a more practical solution, but one that Stagecoach would have to implement, is one bus between Carnforth and Milnthorpe, which can connect to their 555 route at either end, and also connect with the trains at Arnside and Silverdale. The other problems with the current 552 bus timetable, is that they don't start early enough or run late enough for people to get to work, and their frequency is very poor (2 to 4 hours between buses). If new houses are built on the Sandside/Storth/Carr Bank side of the AONB, many workers will have no alternative but to use their cars.
- Silverdale Station poorly connected to the village.
- Education – no secondary school in AONB, need to establish primary school capacities.
- Limited social facilities, people can feel isolated in rural communities.
- Scale of development likely to yield very limited developer contribution for infrastructure improvements.
- Perception that rural roads are unsafe hence calls for 40mph limit – but probably a separate issue to development plan – probably not justification for broad brush approach.
- Parking at Arnside Station and related opportunities with sites put forward around.
- Provision of safe walking routes to public transport.
- Narrow roads and lanes making waste collections or goods deliveries difficult.

Opportunities:

- Encouraging walkers + cycling –
  - Facilities at station
  - Storage in new homes?
- Opportunities related to Morecambe Bay cycle route and England Coastal path and for connection to these routes.
- Opportunities for parking at Silverdale station
- Any scope for extend rural wheels scheme into Lancashire – developer contributions.
- Open up the blocked former rail bridge at Sandside, so that there is a continuous off-road path along the disused railway to Arnside.
- CCC pointed out that all flood risk should be considered in planning and Flood Maps for Surface Water are available. It should be presumed that **development is not to be permitted on at least those parts within the site that are known to be at risk of flooding** from any source.
- CCC said that the scale of development (around 150-200 units spread across the AONB in multiple small sites over 15 years) was **too small to have a significant effect** on our network or to deliver significant developer contributions.
- Re applying a **blanket 40mph speed limit across the roads in the AONB**.

CCC replied that there was a process outside planning by which this could be considered but it would need the support of members and the local community and would be **contrary to guidance and unlikely to be successful**. TRO's are usually used because of specific issues at specific locations. We also commented that due to the nature of the roads and locations speeds in reality are much lower than the national speed limit in any case.

- CCC state there is an existing problem of on street parking at both railway stations so we **believe we can support further car parking at these stations.**
- CCC would need to **look at each site individually** to take a view on all the sites are **accessible to the highway network**.
- CCC - We are not likely to know about details such as ransom strips, etc.

SLDC Public Protection Comments (sent by email after the event)

- Support active travel in the AONB as well as public transport that can link in with active travel.
- Opportunities – Could include a bike parking project in the area at key locations such as the station, schools, village halls and outside businesses (for both workplaces and visitors); better footpaths/multi use which can take walkers off the roads
- Morecambe Bay Partnership – Arnside viaduct feasibility study – how does this link in? Potential opportunity?
- Comments on contaminated land and other EP issues will be explored at a later date when the specific sites are released.

NW Ambulance Service Comments (sent by email after the event)

In respect of constraints/opportunities for the Ambulance Service the potential effects of the plan would be:

- Increased population will have an impact on our responses and resources. It is important we know about numbers and types of developments so that we can plan and react to future requirements.
- Location of developments is important to us as we have an eight minute window from receiving a genuine 999 call to arriving at the scene. Location of developments is required to determine where best to position vehicles to achieve the required response time.

Do you have an indicative time frame for next planning stages which will identify the potential developments in greater detail?

Does your Council offer a bidding system for CIL funding? Following notice of your detailed proposed New Local Plan we would need to forecast the impact of any future development proposals upon our service provision. This would highlight whether there would be a case for us needing extra resources to cover the future developments e.g. an additional operational vehicle. If it did this would be the basis for a potential bid.